

## REMARKS

Claims 1-92 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected. Claims 1, 17, 32, 47, 63 and 78 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office issued a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 for lack of support in the specification because of the recently added limitation “combining video conference input signals” recited in claim 1, and similar language in other claims. Rather than argue the supporting language, the rejected language has been removed and new language directly from the specification has been introduced to the claims. Note that at page 4, lines 17-19, in the specification it is stated that “a multicast group, or simply a data group, is a multicast address representing a community of members who are interested in particular stream(s) of data.” Applicant has therefore introduced to the independent claims the limitation that each virtual channel simultaneously carries multiple streams of video conference data of a single video conference, each stream transmitted from a different member device. Common sense dictates that in a video conference having at least three members, each member receives multiple data streams, i.e., one from each other member. The claims have been further amended to recite a single video conference having at least three members to emphasize the applicability of the invention to mitigating rekeying of other members. Because the new limitation is copied from the specification, withdrawal of the §112 rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 17, 32, 47, 63 and 78 distinguish the combination of Caronni in view of Chaney and further in view of Aziz because of the newly introduced limitation discussed above in combination with limitations already present in the claims. In particular, none of the cited

references, either alone or in combination, teach multiple virtual channels defined by differing expiration times, where each of those virtual channels simultaneously carries multiple streams of data from the same video conference. The Office suggests that Chaney teaches channels with expiration times, but Chaney's teaching is limited to time-interleaving of video inputs. In other words, Chaney concerns selecting one and only one video input to broadcast on the virtual channel, whereas the presently claimed invention broadcasts multiple streams of the video conference on multiple virtual channels simultaneously. Applying the teaching of Chaney to Caronni would lead to the absurd result of a video conference where each member could only view one other member on the virtual channel because of time-interleaved inputs. In the case where three or more members are in the video conference, that would be unacceptable. Adding Aziz to the combination might move keys closer to some nodes, but fails to avoid rekeying of some members entirely as the present invention advantageously does by placing members in different virtual channels of the same video conference. Claim 1 therefore distinguishes the cited combination by reciting "establishing a plurality of virtual channels for the video conference multicast session, each virtual channel simultaneously carrying multiple streams of video conference data of the single video conference, each stream transmitted from a different member device, each virtual channel defined by an amount of time remaining until expiration, at least two of which are different, and being operable to deliver the same video conference to member devices associated with that respective virtual channel." Claims 17, 32, 47, 63 and 78 recite similar distinguishing language. Claims 2-16, 18-31, 33-46, 48-62, 64-78, and 79-92 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-92 is therefore requested.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney, at 978-264-4001 (X305) so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

July 31, 2006  
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/  
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
125 Nagog Park  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-156  
Dd: 9/6/06